Application No.: 10/811,246 Docket No.: SON-1659/CON (80001-3011)

## **REMARKS**

This is a second preliminary amendment. Independent claim 1, 3, 4 and 7 were amended to recite that the chrominance non-uniformity correction signal is not a luminance correction signal.

In accordance with the Decision on Appeal in U.S. Patent Application 09/417,714, of which the present application is a continuation thereof, U.S. Patent No. 5,260,797 to Muraji et al. discloses and teaches "by correcting the amplitude of video signals in consideration of the dimming characteristics of projection lenses, an image free from uneven color can be displayed on the projection screen." See Decision on Appeal at page 6, lines 3-5, citing Muraji et al. '797 at col. 7, lines 48-51, and affirming this in the Decision at page 9, lines 5-7. Applicant notes that the Board never addressed the specific claim limitation recited in claims 3:

"wherein a chrominance non-uniformity correction signal is superimposed on the video signal which is supplied to the liquid-crystal display panel which projects the left-side-right inverted video image"

or the element in claim 4 which recites

"wherein chrominance non-uniformity correction signal is superimposed on the common voltage which is supplied to the liquid-crystal display panel which projects the left-side-right inverted video image"

or the element in claim 7 which recites

"a chrominance non-uniformity correction circuit providing a chrominance nonuniformity correction signal to the electrical signal processing system for canceling chrominance non-uniformity." Application No.: 10/811,246 Docket No.: SON-1659/CON (80001-3011)

and as a result the color is adjusted. However, the Board never reached the issue of the presence of a chrominance correction signal that is not a luminance correction signal. That is, a separate signal that adjusts color and not intensity, nor the presence of a chrominance correction circuit that does not adjust luminance. Accordingly, Applicant has amended claims 1, 3, 4 and 7 to recite that the chrominance correction signal is not a luminance correction signal.

As the Board has determined that Muraji et al. 797 only disclose and teach the use of a luminance correction, Applicant believes that in view of the above amendments all claims are now in condition for allowance.

Application No.: 10/811,246 Docket No.: SON-1659/CON (80001-3011)

Applicant believes no fee is due with this response. However, if a fee is due, please charge our Deposit Account No. 18-0013, under Order No. SON-1659/CON from which the undersigned is authorized to draw.

Dated: August 25, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

Ronald P. Kananen

Registration No.: 24,104

Robert S. Green

Registration No.: 41,800

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W.

Suite 501

Washington, DC 20036

(202) 955-3750

Attorneys for Applicant